

REMARKS

The claim presently stands rejected as being anticipated by Walker.

In response to the previous rejection, applicants argued a difference in operation as between Walker and the claimed invention. Applicants argued that the Walker reference needed to extrude radially against an under surface of a truncated triangular backup ring 42 pressing backup ring 42 into a cut out pocket 28 provided expressly to retain back up ring 42 (see Col. 3, line 10, of Walker). In contrast, applicants argued that the claimed invention extruded axially, and did not require a similar backup configuration or a cut out pocket like that disclosed by Walker.

The Examiner rejected applicants' argument, based on an interpretation that when the seal of Walker extrudes, it exerts both an axial force component and a radial force component against the back up ring.

Applicants respectfully submit that the axial versus radial argument still raises a valid point of differentiation. Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's interpretation that there would be a force with both an axial component and a radial component working against the back up ring of Walker. However, applicants respectfully submit that the pocket 28 described by Walker is critical to its operation. Truncated triangular backup ring 42 bridges the extrusion gap. Cut out pocket 28 is specifically designed to direct the flow of the O-Ring against the back up ring 42. It is fundamental engineering that pressure always acts normal to the containing surface. If Walker acts both radially and axially, as maintained by the Examiner, it is only because the O-Ring is directed first axially and then radially by the pocket 28.

As illustrated in **FIG. 6** and **7** of the present application, the seal groove provides a planar containment surface. Pressure applies a force solely in an axial direction normal to the planar containment surface. It is respectfully submitted that the teachings of Walker could not be

applied to the present application. They would have to adapt the seal groove by making a pocket that would act in the manner of pocket 28. There is also a question as to whether Walker is intended for a one time use, in view of the manner in which the O-Ring seal is extruded. Of course, in the present application, the closure is a door that may be opened and closed at will and is in fact opened and closed during use several times a day.

Applicants have emphasized these differences by making amendments to the claim to indicate:

the closure serving as a door adapted to be opened and closed at will,

the seal groove providing a planar containment surface, and

the peripheral seal is extruded by pressure applying a force solely in an axial direction normal to the planar containment surface against the backing ring.

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}



Kevan L. Morgan
Registration No. 42,015
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first-class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the below date.

Date: June 13, 2004



KLM:dlw

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100